To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

/	
Signature (Jacquely Breen
Print Name	JARQUELYN BRUNS
Address	1925 AFFLERBACH
County	GOLIAD
Date	1-12-11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]..."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

THEREFORE; I, the undersigned resident of Goliad County, Texas or adjacent county urge the EPA to oppose granting an Aquifer Exemption Permit in conjunction with Uranium Energy Corp.'s (UEC) Class III Underground Injection Control Permit Application UR03075.

Signature	Goben Sporwood
Print Name	- ROBIN SHERWOOD
Address	P.O. Box 39- Fannin, Tx2200
County	Goliad
Date	1-11-11

1

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	mathe &	That	
Print Name	Martha G. U		
Address	PO BOX 1101,	Yorktown	78164
County	Goliad		
Date	1-11-2011		

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Roy	ala	n War	d
Print Name	Roy	ALA	Y WAR	D
Address	P.0:	Box	1101	
County	GOLAN	D		
Date	1-1	11-11	/	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature _	Virginia Zieg	
Print Name_	Virginia Zillia	
Address	526 EDOK SE	
County _	Toolied	_
Date _	1-17-2011	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature _	Dorothy albrecht	
Print Name_	Dorothy Albrecht	
Address _	1732 Post Oak Road, Goliad, TX 7796	3
County _	Goliad	
Date _	Jan. 11, 2011	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

	Emmott albrocks
Signature	(Memsel Mebrocht
Print Nam	e Emmest ALBRECHT
Address	1732 Post OAK Road, Bdraft 17963
County	BOLIAR
Date	1-11-11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

B

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Kathy allrecht	
Print Name	Kathy Albrecht	_
	4792 Danforth Road	-
County	Goliad	_
Date	1/13/11	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Jun	rifux	Inklam	
Print Name	- Te	nnifer	Anklam	
Address	5731	State	Highway 11	9
County	Golic		0 0	
Date	1/6	Lo	- Augustus george A. g.	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

THEREFORE; I, the undersigned resident of Goliad County, Texas or adjacent county urge the EPA to oppose granting an Aquifer Exemption Permit in conjunction with Uranium Energy Corp.'s (UEC) Class III Underground Injection Control Permit Application UR03075.

Signature `

Print Name

Address

County

Date

859 N US Hwy 183

YORKTOWN, TX

1-5-2011

Yo: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

	Thomas anklan	
Print Name	THOMAS ANKLAM	
Address	14859 N. US HWY 183, YORKTOWN,	1X
County	GOLIAD	
Date	1/5/2011	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Thomas anklam Jr.
Print Nan	10 THOMAS ANKLAM JR.
Address	5731 ST. HIGHWAY 119
County	GOLIAD
Date	1/6/2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Karon arnold
Print Name	Karon Arnold
Address	120 Dobskyville Rd. Yorktown, TX 78164
County	Goliad
Date	1-11-2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Rugh holy		
Print Name	RAYMOND ARNOLD		
Address	120 DOBSILY VELLE PD, YORKTONN	TX	78164
County	GOLEAD		
Date	11 SAN 11		

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Barlara	audil	t		
Print Name	Barbara	Audilet	iiii aataa aa		
Address	13340 5	Hwy 183	Yorktown,	TX	78/64
County	DeWitt_	U			
Date	1-11-11				

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Doep Redict
Print Name	Douglas Audilet
Address	13340 5. Hwy 183 YORKTOWN, TEX
County	De Witt
Date	1-11-11

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents:

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the commence and have becauted in this of the commental as a commental and the

tu una fraktien adet, som am steller er fræg film ant silensen beræ

and the part to differ a figure part of the high

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

THEREFORE; I, the undersigned resident of Goliad County, Texas or adjacent county urge the EPA to oppose granting an Aquifer Exemption Permit in conjunction with Uranium Energy Corp.'s (UEC) Class III Underground Injection Control Permit Application UR03075.

in the first of the second of the trip when this place is the later of a figuration, a comparable

To these was an other of party and Roman and an initial translation to a companied

ed ment of the Augustus Mandage offers and of a commission with the

ranga akabatek mendipaten bang bangan berbing magai albah at mitin at mendelik berbina at terlebah 🗗

There is the annual of recognitions are in a companied and a c

Signature	aldon Baile.	es mas our wildings
Print Name	e Aldon J. Bade	i di pina pina pina pina pina pina pina pin
Address	147 W. Fm 1961 Yorktown, Tx 78	164
County	Goliad	
7:00 600 \$103.		terpor to the second

Signature on Back

PETITION

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

ましゃ さいしょうしゅう Managery Africa Article Managery Africa

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

The late of the second and the William Website

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]..."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Claronce . B. Baka.
Print Nam	IE CLAREUCE LEROY BAKER
Address	5-4-49 EFM 884 TX 7816C
County	goliad TEXAS
Date	11 JAN 11

Margie Smith

From:

"carolyn wells" <crlyn_wells@yahoo.com>
"Margie Smith" <wmsmith@dishmail.net>

To: Sent:

Monday, January 03, 2011 10:05 AM

Subject:

Petition

PETITION

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3):

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Glenda Bodenhamen
Print Name	Glenda Bodenhamer
	208 Weeasthe TX 77993
County	Dewitt
Date	1-4-2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	David Bowllan
Print Name	David Bowman
Address	1323 E. Fm 1961, Goliad, T4 77963
County	Goliad
Date 3	3-15-2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	· Norathy Bowman	
	me Doroth Bowman	
Address	7323 E. Fm 1961 Boliad 747796	7
County	Goliad	
Date	3-15-2011	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	ABron	
	GEXIE BROWY	
Address	468 FM 1961 YORKTOWN	Ta 78164
County	GOLIAIS	
Date	12-30-2010	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Reta J. Brown		
Print Name	Reta F Brown	,	
Address	468 FM 1961		
County	Goliad		
Date	12-30-10		

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

-	Cathy Bru
Print Name	Cathy Brunicardi
Address	P.O. Box 300, Weesatche, TX 77993
	Goliad
Date	1/12/2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	(during Brusse)	
Print Name	DENNIE BRUNS	
Address	1925 AFFLERBACH RD	YORKTOWN, TX 78164
County	GOLIND	
Date	1-11-2011	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

THEREFORE; I, the undersigned resident of Goliad County, Texas or adjacent county urge the EPA to oppose granting an Aquifer Exemption Permit in conjunction with

Uranium Ei	nergy Corp.'s (UEC) Class III Underground Injection Control Permit
Application	UR03075,
Signature	Chenger look
Print Name	Ginger Cook
Address	3933 Kilgore Rd. Golited TX 77963
County	Golind
Date	1-1-11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Jogm Coll	
Print Name	Lynn Cook	
Address	3933 Kilgore Rd Golind TX	7796
County	Golind	
Date	1-3-11	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Kloggud Oleka
Print Name	Raymond Decker
Address	P.O. Box 300 Weesatche TX 77993
County	Goliad
Date	1/12/2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Box of Doules
Print Name	BILLY L. DORNBURG
	13613 U.S. Hwy. 183N Golind, Tx 77963
County	Goliad Co
Date	1/16/11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]..."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Linda S. Dornlurg
Print Name	Linda S. Dornburg
Address	13613 US Hwy 183 N
County	Goliad, TX
Date	1/16/11
,	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature _	IT DROW
Print Name	Jennifer Drozd
Address _	Po Box 252 Weesatche, Tx. 7799:
County _	Goliad
Date	01-11-2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	GW .	
Print Name	Karry Drozd	
Address	Po Box 252 Weesatche Tx.	77993
County	Golial	,
Date	01-11-2011	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Diona Ford
Print Name	DIANA FORD
Address	5287 FM 884
County	DE WITT
Date	1/13/11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Don Fal	
Print Nan	ne Don Fond	
Address	5287 FM 884	
County	Den'TTCO	
Date	1-13-11	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Debbie Foston	
Print Name		
Address	1099 Duder stack Rd #2	Yorktown TX
County	Collad	78164
Date	1-11-11	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature _	Jamie Friedrichs	
Print Name	Jamie Friedrichs	
Address	642 Lemle Rd, Golad Tx	77963
County	Goliad	
Date	1/16/11	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]..."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature _	MARKS
Print Name	RICHARD B GILL
Address	917 COLAKE DRIVE
County	VICTORIA TX
Date	1/8/11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Ruth B. St. Il	
Print Name	Ruth B Gill	
Address	917 Colake	
County	Victoria	
Date	Jan. 4, 2011	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Darla	ad B	bor	,	
		d GLOO			
Address	2484	FM 622	GoLIA	d, Tx.	77963
County	GoLiA	d Coun	Ty	·····	
	1-14-		,		

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline":

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Sherry Gloor	
Print Nam	Sherry Gloor	
Address	2484 FM 622, Goliad, TX 77963	₹
County	Goliad	,
Date	1-14-2011	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]..."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Eva Well Guffiel
Print Name	Eva Nell Griffith
Address	4335 Danforth Rd., Goliad, TX 77963
County	Goliad
Date	1-16-11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]..."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	GERALD GRIFFITH
Print Name	GERALD GRIFFITH
Address	4335 DANFORTH RD
County	GOLLAD, TX
Date	1/16/11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Ernest & Hausman
	ERNEST P HAUSMAN
Address	103 OXPORD DR SAN ANTONIO TX 8217
County _	BEXAR
Date	IAN 10 2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Paul Hausman	
Print Name	PAUL J HAUSMAN	
Address	3723 TICONDEROGA SAN ANTONIO TX	78230
County _	BEXAL	
Date _	JAN 10 2011	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	If trappletre DM fr.
Print Name	Tracy Headstream 50
Address	5731 St. Wighway 117
County	Cokad
Date	[-16-1]

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

	11 11 11 11	
Signature	Karry Hollis had	
Print Name	LANNY Hollingshead	
Address	917 Colake Dr	
County	Victoria	
Date .	1-7-11	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Marie Halemaneod
	MARIE HOUNGSHEAD
Print Name	GIT COLLING.
Address	The overall and the second
County	Victoria
Date	1-6-11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

THEREFORE; I, the undersigned resident of Goliad County, Texas or adjacent county urge the EPA to oppose granting an Aquifer Exemption Permit in conjunction with Uranium Energy Corp.'s (UEC) Class III Underground Injection Control Permit

Application UR03075.

Signature

Print Name Doug Huff

Address

P.O. Box 112 WESATCHE, TX77993

County GOLIAD

Date 1-//-1]

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	· Jana Huff	
	me Tara Huff	
Address	P.O. Box 112	Welsatche, 7x 77993
County	Goliad	
Date	-1/n(1)	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature Alada Bocker				
Print Name (Inda Koehler				
Address	3595 B	ego Roco	Goliad tx	<u>7</u> 7963
County	Goliad			
Date	1-15-11		· ·	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature _	Randell S. Kochler
	Randell L. Koehler
Address	3595 Bego Road, Goliad, TX 77963
County _	Goliad
Date _	1~15-11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Atle	nkom
Print Name	Jinny	W. Lenke
Address	1029 FM	1351
County	GoliAd	
Date	1-12-11	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Vernall & Tember
Print Name	Vernell Filenke
Address	1029 FM 9351
County	GoliAd
Date	(-t2-11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3):

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Barry Kames
Print Name	Barry Karnei
Address	PO Box 231, Wersatche TX77993
County	Goliad
Date	Jan. 13, 2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]..."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Allenn Karner
Print Name	GleNN Karnei
Address	4560 Danforth Rd.
County	Goliad, Tup
Date	1-16-11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Dadino Karnes
Print Name	· Vadine Karnei
Address	POBOX 231, weesortche TX 77993
County	Goliad
Date	1-13-2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]..."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Rosie Karne	<i>c</i>
Print Name	ROSIF KAR	NEi
Address	Po BOX 174	WEE Atche TE)
County	ColiAd	
Date	1-16-2011	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Liverya	anne	<u>ll</u>	run			
GEORGIA	ANNE	IF	win			
3148 W.	FM8	84,	WEESA	TCHE,	TX	7993
GOLIAD						
12/30/10						
	GEORGIA 3148 W. GOLIAD	3148 W. FM 8	GEORGIA ANNE IR 3148 W. FM 884, GOLIAD	GEORGIA ANNE IRWIN 3148 W. FM 884, WEESA GOLIAD	3148 W. FM 884, WEESATCHE, GOLIAD	GEORGIA ANNE IRWIN 3148 W. FM 884, WEESATCHE, TX -

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

• /	
Signature	Laules of full
Print Name	Rasie Z. IRWINJ
Address =	3148 F.M. 884, WeesTACHe
County _	Galiad. IX
Date _	12-31-10.

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	D-10-2	
Print Nam	e Randy Janak	
Address	6472 E. FM 1961 Goliand	
County	Goliad	
Date	1 15 11	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

THEREFORE; I, the undersigned resident of Goliad County, Texas or adjacent county urge the EPA to oppose granting an Aquifer Exemption Permit in conjunction with Uranium Energy Corp.'s (UEC) Class III Underground Injection Control Permit Application UR03075.

Print Name Teresa Danak

Address H72 & FM 196/ Coliad

County Date 115/1/

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Carl Jenkins Jr.
	Carl E. Jenkins, Jr.
Address	580 Whoeler Lane
County	Goliad, Texas 77963
Date	1/11/11
•	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Danna & Tenkins
Print Name	DONNA L JENKINS
Address	580 Wheeler LANE
County	Golind, TEXAS 77963
Date	1/11/11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

	$\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{O})$	
Signature	ames Wenns	
Print Name	JAMES W JOHNSON	
Address	POBOX 905, GOLLAD, TX 7796	3
County	GOLIAD	
Date	1/14/2011	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]..."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Halla Chlusa
Print Name	Kathy Tohuson
Address	PO BOX 905
County	Goliad
Date _	1/14/11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

	A(I)
Signature	
Print Name	CHRIS LOEST
Address	417 N. FORT ST
County	GOLIAD TX
Date	1-14-11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]..."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

G. 1	Dill 1 11
Signature	FATTY LOVETT
Print Nam	e left for the
Address	5770 Danforth Rd.
County	GoliAd TEXAS 77963
Date	1/16/2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]..."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents:

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate:

THEREFORE; I, the undersigned resident of Goliad County, Texas or adjacent county

urge the EPA to oppose granting an Aquifer	Exemption Permit in conjunction with
Uranium Energy Corp.'s (UEC) Class III U	nderground Injection Control Permit
Application UR03075.	~ ^
I E. MY	
Signature Signature	9 00
Print Name PARICK E. MC	pery m
Address POB 1205 Parci	29 TX 77963
County Goulds	
Date 1/14/2011	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County; (copies attached of ag census)

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate; (summary copy attached)

Signature	Malle	
Print Name	H. Scor Mc Gowan	
Address	POBOT 263, 120 FM 884 E	WESATCHE, TX 77997
County	Colino	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Date	1/10/11	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Rich McKenn
Print Name	Rick McKinny
Address	107 Tanpa
County	Goliad
Date	12/29/10

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Mary ann Overlander
	Mary Ann Overlander
Address	3744 old Goliad Rd
County	Goliad
Date	1-11-2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Mary Pargmann
Print Name	MARY PARCMANN
Address	2550 Pargnano PD. YOA KumTx
County	DEWITT 77995
Date	1-15-11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

THEREFORE; I, the undersigned resident of Goliad County, Texas or adjacent county urge the EPA to oppose granting an Aquifer Exemption Permit in conjunction with Uranium Energy Corp.'s (UEC) Class III Underground Injection Control Permit Application UR03075.

Signature Alles Signature

Print Name Across Affine Address

County Delli C. Thereon (1979)

Date (21-15-30)

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature _	Mehin Koesslu	
Print Name	Melvin Roessler	
Address	56 KAthy St VictoRiA, TX 7	7905
County .	Victoria & Goliad	
Date	1-14-11	:

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	La Fern Roessler
Print Name	LA FERN ROESSLER
Address	56 KATHY ST, VICTORIA TX 77905-3641
County	VICTORIA, (Residence) GOLIAO (LANDOWNER)
Date	01-14-2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Leighen Salze	
Print Name	Leigh Ann Salge	
Address	903 mcGuill Rd	
County	Goliad	
Date	sludg	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

THEREFORE; I, the undersigned resident of Goliad County, Texas or adjacent county urge the EPA to oppose granting an Aquifer Exemption Permit in conjunction with

Uranium En Application	nergy Corp.'s (UEC) Class III Undergroun UR03075.	d Injection Control Permit
Signature		· · · · · · ·
Print Name	Kristen Shley	·
Address	240 E FM 1961	Coolad, To 7903
County	Colad.	
Date	418/11	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

	V
Signature	Luce
Print Name	Travis Series
Address	240 EFM1961
County	Goliad
Date	1-12-11

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Matter D. Schulze
Print Name	Mattie D. Schulze
Address	2281 W. Ward St
County	Codiad
Date	/ -//-//

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County; (copies attached of ag census)

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate; (summary copy attached)

Signature	Deborah J. Sco	it		
Print Name	Deborah L. Sc	cott		
Address	PO BOX 263, 120 F	m 883 East	Weesatche T	Z
County	Goliad		77993	3
Date	1/13/11	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

THEREFORE; I, the undersigned resident of Goliad County, Texas or adjacent county urge the EPA to oppose granting an Aquifer Exemption Permit in conjunction with Uranium Energy Corp.'s (UEC) Class III Underground Injection Control Permit Application UR03075.

Signature 1/1 13 Med

Print Name Voshva B, Secord

Address 445 Duclestadt LN,

County Grobiad

Date 1-11-2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature /	Carry Shepler	
Print Name	RANDY SHEPLER	
Address	P.O. BOX 52, GOLIAIS TX 7796	3
County	Goleal	
Date	1-11-2011	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature _	SUS on Shiplein	
Print Name	SUSAN SHEPLER	
Address	P.O. BOX 52 - GOLII	40 TX 77963
County	GOLIAD	
Date	1-11-11	

Margie Smith

From:

"carolyn wells" <crlyn_wells@yahoo.com>

To:

"Margie Smith" <wmsmith@dishmail.net> Monday, January 03, 2011 10:05 AM

Sent: Subject:

Petition

PETITION

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

. -	\mathcal{L}
Signature	Murey Clarmus
Print Name	EDWARD E SIMMORS
Address	44 W FM 884 YOFTEN, TO 17893
County	De Witt Goliad
Date	1-4-2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County; (copies attached of ag census)

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate; (summary copy attached)

Signature	Barbara Smith
Dignature	
Print Name	Barbara Smith
Address	376 Goliad N Goliad, TX 79963
County	Goliad
Date	1-13-11

Margie Smith

From:

"carolyn wells" <crlyn_wells@yahoo.com>

To:

"Margie Smith" <wmsmith@dishmail.net> Monday, January 03, 2011 10:05 AM

Sent: Subject:

Petition

PETITION

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature _	Margie Smith
Print Name_	Margie Smith
Address	4 Los Robles Rd, Yorktown, TX 78169
County _	DoWitt
Date _	1-4-2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Junell Sugge
Print Name	Junell Sugas
Address	1483 E 884 Worktown Jx 78164
	Daliad
Date	1-14-2011

Margie Smith

From:

"carolyn wells" <crlyn_wells@yahoo.com>

To:

"Margie Smith" <wmsmith@dishmail.net> Monday, January 03, 2011 10:05 AM

Sent: Subject:

Petition

PETITION

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

THEREFORE; I, the undersigned resident of Goliad County, Texas or adjacent county urge the EPA to oppose granting an Aquifer Exemption Permit in conjunction with Uranium Energy Corp.'s (UEC) Class III Underground Injection Control Permit Application UR03075.

Signature Soldby f. Merili

Print Name Dorothy P. Trevilion

Address 1048 yorktown Slickfield Rd

County Dewitt.

Date 1-4-2011

Margie Smith

From:

"carolyn wells" <criyn_wells@yahoo.com>

To:

"Margie Smith" <wmsmith@dishmail.net> Monday, January 03, 2011 10:05 AM

Sent: Subject:

Petition

PETITION

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

	11/1-
Signature	M Mym
Print Name	TOM TREVILION
Address	PODX 1214 VORKTOWN, TX 78/64
County	co lud ett
Date	1/4/11
	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature	Meanna L. Dacker
Print Name	DEANNA W. WACKER
Address	14682 N. US 183
County	Goliad
Date	1-16-2011

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]...."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

	01 516	
Signature	Hay Vaca	_
Print Name	GARY WACKER	
Address	14682 N. US Hwy 183	
County	GoliAD,	
Date	1-16-2011	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]..."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has never denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

	() - ()		
Signature .	July U	Singu	is _	
Print Name	JILL	WI	<u>66 1</u>	NS
Address	539/ 3	DANFE	DRTH	RD
County	GOLIAT)		
Date	1/16/11		·	

To: The Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6, Dallas, Texas

Whereas, agricultural production and heritage tourism are the primary economic engines of Goliad county;

Whereas, livestock production and wildlife resources account for 89 percent of total agricultural sales in Goliad County;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is part of an underground source of drinking water aquifer;

Whereas, the proposed aquifer exemption is a source of drinking water used for domestic purposes by citizens of Goliad County;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that the use and installation of injection wells are not in the public interest;

Whereas, the Office of the Public Interest Council stated in their closing arguments that Uranium Energy Corp. failed to meet its burden of proof in both permit applications (UR03075 & UR03075PAA1), and therefore, both applications must be denied;

Whereas, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) concluded that "[b]efore the [TCEQ] may authorize a mining operation by injection of pollutants into an aquifer, the law requires that the [TCEQ] review all of the information available to ensure that ... ground and surface fresh water can be adequately protected from pollution." (Tex. Water Code § 27.051(a)(3);

Whereas, the ALJ concluded the permits cannot be issued because evidence indicated "the application may not be sufficiently protective of groundwater."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that mining fluids may migrate vertically and horizontally and may contaminate a Underground Source of Drinking Water [USDW]..."

Whereas, the ALJ concluded "that USDWs within Goliad County and outside the proposed aquifer exemption area may be adversely impacted by UEC's proposed in situ uranium activities."

Whereas, "the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be remanded for UEC to conduct a Northwest Fault pump test ... to determine whether the Northwest Fault is sealed or transmissive" and "if the Commission determines that such remand is not feasible or desirable then the ALJ recommends that the Mine Application and the PAA-1 Application be denied"; (Proposal for Decision at 138)

Whereas, UEC's expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife never addressed the consequences should an accident, mechanical failure or spill occur;

Whereas, UEC expert witness regarding negative impacts on livestock and wildlife testified that consumption of uranium by cattle can affect kidneys and lead to effects on other organs.

Whereas, expert witness for Goliad County offered unchallenged testimony that based on review of the TCEQ records, the TCEQ has **never** denied an amendment to allow higher concentrations of uranium and other constituents to remain in the groundwater post mining than existed prior to mining;

Whereas, expert witness for the Executive Director ("ED") testified that all monitoring of groundwater ceases once an amendment is granted by TCEQ to allow higher concentrations of constituents;

Whereas, USGS report offered at hearing documented that "no well field for which final sample results were found in TCEQ records returned every element to baseline";

Whereas, the ED's expert witness stated he only considered the positive aspects of uranium mining provided by the Applicant and not any negative aspects in his review of the public interest. (Volume 6, page 1234 testimony of David Murry)

Whereas, The Sunset Commission Review of TCEQ summarized that TCEQ's approach to regulation had a significant implementation problem, further stating that TCEQ had ample statutory leeway to regulate;

Signature _	Degral	a Wi	. >	_
Print Name	TERRELI	12/1994		
Address	5391	DANFO	eth	RD.
County	GOLIAD	18		
Date _	1-10	6-11		